

## REMARKS

This responds to the Appeal Decision dated October 27, 2010.

Claims 1 and 15 are amended, claims 10 and 24 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-9, 11-23 and 25-28 remain pending in this application. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, and at least at page 15, lines 1-23. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been introduced with the amendments.

### The Rejection of Claims Under § 112

Claims 10 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 10 and 24 have been canceled, therefore the rejection is believed moot.

### The Rejection of Claims Under § 102

Claims 1-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gatto et al. (U.S. 6,916,247). A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *M.P.E.P. § 2131*. To anticipate a claim, a reference must disclose every element of the challenged claim and enable one skilled in the art to make the anticipating subject matter. *PPG Industries, Inc. V. Guardian Industries Corp.*, 75 F.3d 1558, 37 USPQ2d 1618 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). It is not enough, however, that the prior art reference discloses all the claimed elements in isolation. Rather, “[a]nticipation requires the presence in a single prior reference disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*” *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co.*, 730 F.2d 1452, 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (citing *Connell v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 722 F.2d 1542, 220 USPQ 193 (Fed. Cir. 1983)) (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-28 as amended contain elements not found in Gatto.

For example, claim 1 as amended recites that “the discovery agent and gaming machines on a first side of a firewall coupled to the gaming network, the gaming service on a second side

of the firewall.” Claim 15 recites similar language. Applicant has reviewed Gatto and can find no disclosure of the recited language. Gatto does not disclose a firewall. As a result, Gatto cannot disclose any methods or system in which a discover agent authorizes service provided that exist on the opposite side of a firewall as recited in claims 1 and 15. As a result, Gatto does not anticipate claims 1 or 15. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 15.

Pending claims 2-9 and 11-14 depend from claim 1. Pending claims 16-23 and 25-28 depend from claim 15. These dependent claims are therefore not anticipated by Gatto for at least the reasons discussed above regarding their respective base claims 1 and 15.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (612) 373-6954 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402--0938  
(612) 373-6954

Date December 27, 2010

By

  
Rodney L. Lacy  
Reg. No. 41,136

**CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8:** The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 27th day of December, 2010.

Rodney L. Lacy

Name

  
Signature